DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 084 948 HE 004 816

TITLE	Quality of Educational Life, Priorities for Today.
INSTITUTION	Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, Boulder, Colo.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Mental Health (DHEW), Rockville, Md. Experimental and Special Training Branch.
PUB DATE	Sep 72
NOTE	20p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Activism; *College Environment; *College Role; Educational Quality; *Higher Education; *Mental Health Programs; Student College Relationship; Student Welfare

ABSTRACT

This report discusses how life on campus has been affected by changes in society and changes in the university's role. These changes have placed new demands upon the higher education system. But dynamics within the system have grown inflexible and dehumanizing as a result of system priorities. These priorities set in motion dynamics that compel campus members to conform to system needs. Human concerns that would dictate that the system grow and change in conformity with campus needs are suppressed. The quality of educational life suffers as a result. Problems proliferate as pressure builds between system demands and human needs. A sense of purpose is eroded. Dissatisfactions among campus members are high while crises or conflicts erupt easily. This report illustrates how the change in priorities can be instrumental in resolving campus problems and details the implications this holds for changing mental health delivery systems on campus. For related reports concerning mental health on campus, see HE 004 815, HE 004 827, HE 004 828, HE 004 829, and HE 004 830. (Author/MJM)

ED 084948

Quality of Educational Life Priorities for Today

HE 004 816

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

western interstate commission for higher education

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Quality of Educational Life
Priorities for Today

This report was prepared by the *MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES AND THE CHANGING UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY TASK FORCE* of the WICHE program, Improving Mental Health Services on Western Campuses, funded by a grant (MH 12419-01) from the National Institute of Mental Health, Experimental and Special Training Branch.

Task Force Members

Dr. Theodore Volsky, Chairman
Vice Provost
University of Colorado

Murray M. DeArmond, M.D.
Psychiatrist, Student Health Service
University of Arizona

David Falk
Graduate Student in Community Psychology
University of Colorado & Northwestern University

Dr. Addie Fuhriman
Counseling Psychologist
University of Utah

Dr. Madeleine Leininger
Dean and Professor, School of Nursing
Lecturer in Anthropology
University of Washington

Arthur D. Martinez
Doctoral Candidate in Political Science
former Bi-Cultural Counselor
Mexican American Studies
University of California, Riverside

Karem J. Monsour, M.D.
Director of Counseling
Claremont Colleges

Suzanne Snively
former Student Body President
Reed College

Dr. Arthur Tollefson
Professor of Education and Coordinator
of Graduate Program in College Student
Personnel Administration
Oregon State University

Steve Torres, Regent
New Mexico Institute of Mining
and Technology

Dr. Kenneth Washington
Assistant Superintendent
of Public Instruction
State Department of Education
California

Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education
P. O. Drawer P Boulder, Colorado 80302
September 1972

FOREWORD

The university has grown so large and its management so complex that we have been forced into an era of intense evaluations of higher education. From every level of society different concerns are being voiced. How is the money spent? Is quality education being achieved? What are our goals and what are our priorities for higher education? Why has there been student unrest? How can the university be managed best?

Within the university there has been a layering of departments, disciplines, competing interests, and burgeoning bureaucracies. Students feel lost, faculty feel frustrated, and administrators struggle to manage what seems almost unmanageable.

Reviews of the problems in higher education have already generated suggestions for new educational approaches. But resolution of the problems will take the efforts and ideas of many people both from within and from outside the university. One of the services the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education performs is facilitating the exchange of ideas among centers of higher education in the 13 western states and between higher education and the people of the West.

The WICHE program Improving Mental Health Services on Western Campuses was designed to focus on the very complex human concerns evolving from the current state of higher education. The program, in its study of these problems, has convened task forces deliberately comprised of representative members from the university community and from the larger community. The task force design was used not only to facilitate an exchange of ideas, but also to explore applications of the community model as a means for resolving campus problems.

The work of the Mental Health Services and the Changing University Community task force has provided the philosophical context from which our other task forces have built specific recommendations and models. As the members of this task force discussed and refined their ideas, they decided that many troubled conditions in higher education could be resolved if priorities on campus became concerned with the quality of educational life.

Their final report, *Quality of Educational Life, Priorities for Today*, discusses how life on campus has been affected by changes in society and changes in the university's role. These changes have placed new demands upon the higher education system. But dynamics within the system have grown inflexible and dehumanizing as a result of system priorities--stability, predictability, and maintenance. These priorities set in motion dynamics which compel campus members to conform to system needs. Human concerns that would dictate that the system grow and change in conformity with campus needs are suppressed. The quality of educational life suffers as a result. Problems proliferate as pressures

build between system demands and human needs. A sense of purpose is eroded. Dissatisfactions among campus members are high. Crises or conflicts erupt easily.

The system needs to change it priorities in order for it to be responsive to the people who live, study, and work in higher education. Task force members believe the system can be responsive and humane if its priorities are concerned with the quality of educational life and facilitate growth, change, communication, participation, interrelationship, and fulfillment of objectives within the system. Their report illustrates how the change in priorities can be instrumental in resolving campus problems and details the implications this holds for changing mental health delivery systems on campus.

I wish to express my appreciation to each member of the task force for their participation and contributions to the program. The task force meetings with their frank and honest exchange of ideas were, I believe, a valuable learning experience for us all. I would also like to express my thanks to the program's Staff Associate, Lu Anne Aulepp, who assisted with task force meetings and in the assembling of the final report. The Program Secretary, Linda Martin, lent vital support to our efforts in arranging meeting facilities for the task force and in preparing the report manuscript for publication.

James H. Banning, Ph.D., Director
Improving Mental Health Services on Western Campuses

Quality of Educational Life Priorities for Today

QUALITY OF EDUCATIONAL LIFE
PRIORITIES FOR TODAY

There really can remain little doubt in anyone's mind that our campuses are troubled places. The literature has swelled concerning problems in higher education. Numerous researchers have placed campuses under the microscope, isolated ailments, and offered remedies.

In some ways our task was not unlike these earlier efforts. We were overwhelmed by the troubled conditions in higher education. And like earlier researchers, we were to struggle with the question of how conditions could be improved to make campus a less troubled place. But for us the concern was not individual conditions, but rather the quality of educational life experienced by those who live and work on campus.

This perspective focused our attention upon dynamics in society and the system which give rise to the troubled conditions. It seems evident to us in light of our changing society and changes in the university's role within society that current priorities on campus give rise to dynamics which curtail people's ability to function and learn within the campus community. We recommend that the quality of educational life must be higher education's first concern. And the higher education system needs to set priorities that will facilitate growth, change, communication, participation, interrelationship, and fulfillment of objectives on campus. In this way the system can foster dynamics which will reduce the troubled conditions on campus.

The Changing University

Many of these conditions reflect the university's changing position in society. Once higher education was relatively insulated from society's turmoils. Now local, national, and international events can have repercussions on campus. Now the university has a multitude of interlinking ties with industry, government, and society.

On many campuses the system is poked and prodded to respond to these outside stimuli. And where the roadblocks to communication and participation can be overcome, these stimuli foster growth and change. The institution's objectives become reformulated to meet new problems and demands. But such campuses are few; there are many more places where the system has entrenched itself until the pressures within its community's members explode. Too often the system has used the National Guard as its court of last resort. And too often community members have had to take the system to court to assert their rights.

Thus the system finds itself a victim of its changing environment. It finds itself in the midst of changing social and cultural patterns. It no longer dwells in ivory-tower isolation, and as a consequence its old neutrality is gone. In many respects its functions have become political. It ought to assess its role in relation to such matters as civil rights, women's liberation, ecological and environmental protection and the military-industrial complex when setting its policies procedures, and educational goals. The system would then find it incumbent to discontinue practices that countervail community objectives and look for opportunities to help resolve social concerns important to the community.

Where are the offices of personnel that can help the system adjust, help it grow, communicate, participate, determine and fulfill its objectives, or facilitate its relationships with the different segments of campus and society? Where is a cadre of people who can help the system respond to its changing environment and student body? Seeking and establishing such resources should command high priority within the system.

System Dynamics - Community Needs

Perhaps the most powerful impact society has had upon higher education has been the increasing number of students it sends to college each year. To accommodate the vast number of students, higher education has evolved an enormously complex system. Many units have been built into the system. Each supports a part of the system. Each has generated its own vested interest and bureaucratic regime. Such a system is not adaptable to change, for change threatens the order of the system's fiefdoms and its finely tooled machinery. Decision making is based more upon system priorities--stability, predictability, and maintenance--than upon humanistic concerns.

The system, in its efforts to accommodate the increasing number of students, has grown inflexible and dehumanizing. Yet with the increasing number of students has come a corresponding increase in the variety and intensity of human concerns on campus.

The rapid divergence and change in cultural values being experienced in society are no less evident on campus. Members of the campus who value what is going on now, to the exclusion of the past, are in conflict with those who value the heritage of the past. Conflicts arise between campus members who value structured living modes and those who value unstructured living modes. There are those on campus who only value peer approval and those who only value authority approval. There are those who value spontaneous modes of expression and those who value cautious modes of expression, just as there are those who value intense personal experiences and those who value less personal, more detached experiences. Certainly there is an emerging series of value con-

flicts over the changing roles of women and the orientation of male and female behavior. Conflicting value orientations toward the traditional work ethic are in evidence. There is conflict surrounding values related to shared authority versus central authority, between those who find value and security in established authority figures and organizational systems and those who are threatened and feel impotent in the face of "the establishment." And there is conflict over the purpose of higher education between those who place greatest value in scientific knowledge and those who place greatest value in humanistic endeavors.

The system's ability to respond to these conflicting values is critical. Responses which try to keep the lid on or get the abrasives out of the system diminish the quality of educational life and the opportunity to develop learning experiences. The system needs to build reflexes that will absorb the shocks, accommodate differences, establish channels of understanding, and develop mechanisms by which the system can become self-renewing. The system should ask itself what values it reflects. How do these values mesh with the changing values in society? How can institutional value orientations be changed? How could levels of stress and conflict be reduced among faculty, students, and staff who hold such dichotomous value orientations? How could educational experiences be diversified for the variety of value orientations? How could the campus change to accommodate many life styles. How could power conflicts among students, faculty, and administrators be resolved? How could communication snags be identified and new forms of communication established? How could processes in the system be altered to make objectives more responsive to campus needs or to establish new objectives? How could ways be established on campus to assist members to examine, to be receptive and tolerant, to be able to adjust, and to understand the changing roles and changing values on campus and in society?

The increase number and the heterogeneous nature of the community's membership has brought a heightened social consciousness to the campus. This means the system needs to adopt procedures that will deal with issues which otherwise could become focal points for combative, disruptive conflicts. The participation of campus members in reshaping, redirecting, and innovating programs and policies is one necessary procedure. To maximize its effect, a variety of channels for participation and communication should be open and new channels should constantly be formed, so as issues arise and gather momentum they can be dealt with creatively.

In essence, the system would acquire a genuine understanding of its members' sensitivities to social issues and their political implications. It would become committed to developing means by which campus members can actualize their hopes and beliefs in their campus life, educational endeavors, and vocational goals. A necessary corollary would be an explicit commitment on the part of those in authority that change in the system is as necessary

as change within individuals for growth and well-being. New ventures, new approaches, new styles in living and teaching would be not only acceptable, but authoritatively encouraged, licensed, and empowered to exist within the system.

System Dynamics - Minority Students

If the system is alien to its majority members, with their differing and changing cultural values and social consciousness, it is anathema to its minority members. The campus has few familiar touchstones for them. Usually the campus population is different from that of the minority student's home community. Often the language is different from that used at home. The system has not been designed for minority student admission, retention, and graduation. In fact, the system expects minority students to adjust without incident to the sons and daughters of those who have oppressed their parents. It expects them to achieve scholastically, even though their preparation may be wanting and to manage financial aid money wisely, although it may constitute more money than they ever had at any one time. In addition, minority students are under the pressure of knowing that the majority community is not eagerly awaiting them with their degrees to occupy responsible and productive roles.

Minority students must push hard to achieve an educational quality of life which has meaning for them. Their efforts to change the teaching methods, educational experiences, and curricula to reflect their needs and learning modes meet great resistance. Ethnic studies are just fine if they keep to an era and area that does not threaten current power distributions. Community action aspects of curricula that could teach methods for changing the system which inflicts injustices on minorities are notably absent. Nor has ethnic studies been sanctioned with departmental status.

Minority students may take the path of least external resistance and conform to the traditional mode and content of college. However, in doing so, they may find themselves developing an internally inconsistent system of values, while acquiring a body of knowledge which has no application in their later life. The process is called "whitenizing" by the Black and Brown communities. The students who were enthusiastically sent to college become inimical to their home communities. Education which should foster enlightenment instead perpetuates old prejudices.

Less Ritual, More Freedom

The system needs new patterns of governance which will open channels of communication and participation. Constituencies within the campus community do not want to "take over" the administration but they do want to feel significant and have a sense of self-value. They do need to have access to authority and to partici-

pate in decisions which affect their lives. The system needs to recognize that interaction of the environment with the behavior of the individual allows it to be more dynamic.

The centralized, pyramidal organizational structures that abide in so many areas of campus life are not conducive to community participation. Nor are these structures conducive to interacting or communicating with one another. And seldom do these structures step back and take a long view of how thier separate actions unite in the community to affect the quality of educational life.

A case in point might be the system's mechanics to process functions of the faculty. One formula reads: tenure granted on the basis of research, publication, and teaching. The review criteria and committees are set in motion, and alternative procedures or criteria are not built in. What happens to the individual who loves to teach and is less interested in research or writing? His energies are deflected from teaching by the system. The system conforms his actions to its needs. And what happens to those students who want teachers to devote a great deal of time to their needs? They find the teacher has to spend less time with them in order to fulfill the system's demands.

There are innumerable such mismatches between campus environment and structural organizations and student needs and desires. The system must develop methods for identifying these mismatches in order to build environments and structural organizations that will have a better fit with student developmental needs and the needs of faculty and staff. In fact, these needs would have priority consideration in the designing of university structure and procedures.

The institution, for example, could continually review its admissions policies and procedures to insure that the variety of students that society says should have access to higher education are indeed admitted. Admissions criteria would be continually updated, so that students would not be penalized for circumstances beyond their control. But for students to succeed and not be confronted with gross mismatches between themselves and their educational life, the institution will have to prepare itself for them. Therefore student admissions data should also be analyzed for planning programs, living situations, and curricula relevant to the new students' needs.

For, in light of the diversities within its population, universities offer only a small range of possible instructional settings and modalities. Yet research has shown that different kinds of students respond to different kinds of teaching techniques.

The reward options offered students are equally restricted. Grades and credit hours remain the primary structure of reward on most campuses. But this structure may inhibit the institution's and student's educational objectives. For if credit hours and grades

are the only reward, the need to avoid failure may cause students to choose courses and majors that are likely to produce high grades. This orientation reduces risk-taking and exploration in educational endeavors. It also distorts educational objectives another way. Students soon ask themselves, "How well am I doing in relation to others?" rather than "How well am I doing in relation to my own interests and values?" Alternative reward structures that could be more compatible to educational growth need to be incorporated into the system.

Toward an Educational Colony

Much of the system's dynamics are predicated upon administrators and faculty as the active givers of knowledge and students as the passive receivers. Yet experience is a valuable teacher. This means individuals themselves must take part in their educational growth and understand how to continue the learning process. The quality of educational life is enriched when the system's dynamics work on the order of an educational colony in which each member shares knowledge and actively participates in the learning process. There is an implicit right to fail because greater value is placed upon the learning process and conditions for learning than upon a grade or what is to be learned.

In such an educational colony, educational policy would be determined through a model of collaboration. Students would provide valuable input for designing and evaluating curriculum. Students would also participate in evaluating their work and take part in the evaluation of teachers. While collaboration requires a longer period of time to reach a decision, joint decision making increases the effectiveness of decisions, strengthens commitments to act upon decisions, and insures decision relavancy and congruity with the variety of student and faculty needs.

All segments of the campus would have a representative participatory role in the making of organizational policies. This kind of participation enables the institution to build communication and cohesion among its groups. Through representation and collaboration, each part of the system is interrelated and responsible for its effect upon the running of the entire system. Programs and services are accountable to their constituencies and thus responsive to constituent needs. Representation and collaboration provide the institution continuous feedback by which to assess its functioning and make adjustments to grow and change. The process enables the institution to be self-renewing. The impact of the institution is not accidental, but planned, with goals and objectives based on human needs.

Thus system dynamics within an educational colony would encourage (1) integration of various groups and learning, (2) creative growth and change, and (3) avenues of autonomous and individual expression. Members of the colony would find themselves able to

create subenvironments within the campus structure that would give them a sense of having found a home. They would have access to political leverage in order to exercise a measure of control over matters that directly affect their lives. The colony's environment would afford them a nonauthoritarian atmosphere in which to develop and use an individual sense of discipline.

The importance of a system which fosters an educational colony is best stated by the student members of our task force:

> My constant frustration of not being understood is salved by the discovery that people are good. My mental health is strengthened everytime I understand someone else's differences or make myself understood.
>
> Students desire to promote indigenous planning on the university campus and an exchange between professionals and themselves. A characteristic of any campus should be an organization that enables a free exchange of information and feedback. Ideally, college years are a time when students are most selfishly concerned with their own development. It is essential that they participate in the planning and evaluation of university structures which have been organized for their care.
>
> In a sense we have a desire for a dialectic or 'alternating current' in Charles Reich's terms. I have no desire to be competitive with the professionals. I'm still an idealist who feels intellectual discourse should involve finding the truth, not winning.
>
> --Suzanne Snively

That the university has an impact on students is generally accepted. Yet this impact seems in large measure to be accidental. The sequence of experiences and demands is largely an artifact of organizational patterns rather than a deliberate design coordinated with issues in student development.

What meaning does this kind of environment have for students at different levels of maturity and development? It means that there will be a mismatch of environmental characteristics and student needs for a large number of students. An appropriate target for intervention may well be the institution of higher education, rather than the individual student.

The campus's organizational values and hence its structure should recognize the natural character of growth and development by integrating changes

and innovations as they occur. The resulting diversity will increase the campus's organizational potential to satisfy the developmental demands of its students and faculty by giving them experience in dealing with the ever increasing decisions and ambiguities that accompany societal and personal development.

--David Falk

Artificial Division

For many mental health professionals, the dynamics of the higher education system would be viewed in regard to their effect upon the age-specific developmental tasks in which most students at college are engaged. The tasks are attainment of competence in chosen skills; pride in personal identity; security in moral and social values; and confidence in personal relationships and emotional expression.

The first task, attaining competence in chosen skills, has traditionally been the main preoccupation of higher education. The system has left accomplishment of the other tasks to happenstance. Most important, the system has not been concerned with how its dynamics impede the students' progress in fulfilling these tasks. It has left any problems the student encounters in these other areas in the hands of student and mental health services.

The division thus imposed is artificial, because all these developmental tasks are integral to the students' capacity to learn. From this standpoint, the total environment of the educational enterprise must be taken into account. Living cannot be isolated from learning. Studies cannot be isolated from the students' personal and social concerns. Freedom cannot be sacrificed to regulation and conformity. Human values cannot be sacrificed to technological formulas.

The university has relied upon its mental health and student services to assist those crushed by the system rather than tackling the knotty problems causing suffering that are inherent in the system. Nor have these services become active agents in identifying system failures or suggesting system alternatives that would foster student development.

Thus the full impact mental health concepts might have upon the quality of educational life has been circumscribed. One particularly confining circumstance has been the "medical model."

In response to the university's reliance upon them, the prevailing mental health services on campus follow the medical model of treatment. Thus mental health concepts are used most often as vehicles to remediate individuals, to treat the casualties rather

than the causes. Little time or attention is given to employing these concepts in a mode which would address the cause. This is too often convenient for both the university and the services. Pressures that the service might otherwise bring to bear upon the university for changes in the system remain dormant. And the services can serenely continue visit counts as justification for their existence. Neither has to confront the real issue: what treating all these individuals means in terms of the campus dynamics which cause trouble and conflict.

Use of the medical model confuses mental health concepts with the medical notions of illness and health. Yet mental health is judged in relation to a society's cultural and social norms. These are in a continual state of flux, and so definitions of mental health also change. To align mental health with the dichotomies of medical illness and health is to discount or deny the process of growth and change within both society and individuals that is so basic to its concepts.

The medical model imparts a mystique which gives the impression that only specialists use these concepts. Yet understanding peers, professors, or administrators may do more by their actions than the professionals can to create campus dynamics that produce mentally healthy environments on campus. Anyone on campus who facilitates growth, change, communication, participation, fulfillment of objectives, and interrelationships is putting mental health concepts to their best use.

Finally, use of the medical model serves to mold the type of professional attracted to its service. Treating campus casualties is very different from getting into campus dynamics and working with the sensitive--and political--action points within the system that cause trouble and conflict. The delivery mode and the training for it tend to attract and reinforce introspective, reflective persons. Those who would act as change agents in the interest of mental health on campuses are frustrated by the medical model of service. Many gravitate to other professional outlets.

Developing New Service Models

As is the case with so many of the campus structures, mental health services seem to maintain out-of-date, unidimensional patterns of activity. Assuredly, there will always be the need for one-to-one counseling and therapy. But today's campus is in far greater need of services that will help the community and its groups, including faculty, staff, and administrators, achieve a better quality of educational life.

The campus community needs people who can assess its needs and design programs to meet these needs. The community needs people and methods to map out the mismatches that exist between its sys-

tem's objectives and procedures and its people's objectives and needs. The campus needs negotiators and consultants who can facilitate communications and interrelationships among its various groups. It needs researchers who continually monitor community interactions and shifting values in order to prevent problems that could become dysfunctional conditions within the community.

Clearly the behavioral science knowledge housed within student and mental health services can be a valuable resource for any of these endeavors. But first university services must be mindful of the critical need for greater flexibility, creativeness, and innovation in their own work. They need to more closely approximate in their actions the values and concepts they advocate in their words. They need to provide real and immediate models for students and others--models of persons who believe what they are saying and are willing to risk changing themselves and what they do in genuine ways.

Mental health facilities can begin to make the break with traditional, unidimensional patterns of activity by inviting campus members, particularly students, to become involved with the planning, delivery, and evaluation of services. Community members can define needs that the staff was unaware existed. Equally important, the members can become aware of assistance they might not have realized was available. The interchange of knowledge can lead as well to new patterns of activity, more exciting and rewarding to the staff and community.

Many students and other members of campus are eager to work in capacities that will serve their community and peers. The proliferating student-run services, such as crisis telephone services and drug centers, give ample evidence that they have deep concern and ability to help. Mental health services need to initiate all kinds of paraprofessional programs. In this manner, mental health ideas and techniques are given much wider distribution throughout the community, with greater impact than the professional operating alone could ever hope to achieve. Such programming also provides both the community and the paraprofessional with learning experiences. And again, the cause of communication is facilitated. Services will become aware of needs most pertinent to the community, and the community will become aware of the resources services can provide them.

Community participation in the evaluation of services is vital. It allows recipients to have a significant impact upon matters which directly affect their lives. Through their participation they can achieve changes or modification in services which will make the services conform to their needs.

Serving the Quality of Educational Life

Beyond the dynamics of their immediate operational procedures,

mental health services also need to consider ways they can facilitate change in campus dynamics to enhance educational objectives, participation, communication, and growth. This will mean the mental health professionals will have to spend a great deal of time working with groups of administrators and faculty. Since their position in campus dynamics has been in the main peripheral, they will initially have to spend much of this time communicating and demonstrating mental health concepts beyond remediation.

To do this, mental health personnel will have to deal with the use of power and accesses to authority on campus, as these have direct bearing upon the state of well-being experienced by various members of the community. They need to serve as advocates for the availability of legal assistance to community members who are disenfranchised. They need to propose methods through which those in authority and those who are disenfranchised can understand one another and negotiate resolutions for problems. They need to assist regents, administrators, and faculty to understand they dynamics of value conflicts on campus. They need to assist groups of students to understand dynamics of the system and show them how to organize effectively to achieve influence and power within the system. They can help all members of the community understand how actions convey messages and the meaning of these messages.

Mental health services will have to become involved in the educational functions of the community. They need to make themselves available resources for assessing students' abilities in learning situations and designing new teaching methods, learning situations, and classroom structures that enhance the students' potential. They need to consult with academic departments so a transfer of learning with regard to social situations and cultural values will be facilitated. They need to be advocates for more flexibility in curricula and interdisciplinary cooperation so students will find the mobility necessary to follow their academic interests.

Members of the mental health service will have to work with all segments of the university in building policies, programs, and procedures which correlate with all of the student's developmental needs. The campus community needs to learn that for students to develop and have pride in personal identity, the system will have to afford them the opportunity to obtain self-worth through participatory governance, to understand the give and take such efforts demand, and to experience the satisfaction of having made a difference in matters that control their lives. Mental health professionals must help the institution realize that it can be instrumental in students' security in social and moral values if it affords them the experience of dealing with or building values in the system. The process can enable the student to test and establish values rather than just knocking the system that is built on values contradictory to their point of reference. And the professional will need to become involved with all parts of

the system in creating a variety of educational experiences that will allow students to achieve confidence in personal relationships and emotional expression.

In other words the service's activities need to be oriented more toward outreach activities, working with groups in the community on issues that affect the community's quality of life, than toward remedial, one-to-one therapy. Many services have confined the meaning of outreach to sending the professional out into the student traffic patterns such as the library, residence hall, or student union to do one-to-one counseling. While this has benefited some students who find it difficult to cross the street to the counseling center, it falls short of a true outreach to the community with the intervention, preventions, and innovations that can result.

Obviously, as services take a more active role in the promotion of mental health and quality educational life on campus the implications for in-service and academic training will become explicit. Current training and in-service continuing education focus on traditional clinical styles that emphasize remedial techniques. Certainly, future efforts will expand their purview so mental health personnel will understand environmental and architectural influences on human behavior, systems analysis and dynamics, and community assessment and organization.

Training will also have to make mental health professionals aware of the value others in the community can have in the provision of services and enable the professionals to identify and train these people. Academic departments will have to develop curricula for training mental health allied personnel. And the profession and its academic units will have to build access to and training for career ladders in mental health fields.

Summary

If optimal learning is to occur and troubled conditions on campus are to subside, we believe institutions of higher education must have greater concern for the quality of educational life they afford their constituencies. We feel the concern for the quality of educational life will necessitate a reordering of priorities on campus. Future priorities will have to facilitate growth, change, communication, participation, interrelationship, and fulfillment of objectives for both the system and its individuals. The system's dynamics will then afford more unity between education's traditional humanistic values and the human needs evidenced on campus. As a result the institution will be able to continually renew itself in regard to our changing society and the changing needs of campus members.

The troubled conditions on campus demand that every resource be used in establishing a better quality of educational life. Mental

health services cannot shirk their responsibilities in helping the system change and become more responsive to human concerns. Traditional service models and priorities will have to give way to new models and priorities that will have greater impact in the community and upon issues that affect the community's quality of life.

The mental health system, the broader educational system, and indeed the entire societal system must at all times be adaptive to the change which is in process, not only within their particular bounds, but outside as well. All must understand this and act upon the realities of change. To do otherwise is to harbor illusions and to live in a world of fantasy.

1532700000045200:3.5M:872:GD:JP:3H31

Improving Mental Health Services on Western Campuses

Advisory Committee

DR. JAMES G. ALLEN, Department of Human Development, University of Hawaii

DR. PAUL BLOLAND, Vice President Student Affairs, University of Southern California

DR. ALFREDO CASTANEDA, Chairman for Mexican-American Studies, University of California at Riverside

JOHN EVERITT, Student, University of Colorado

JEWELLE GIBBS, Staff Psychiatric Social Worker, Stanford University

DR. ERNEST W. HARTUNG, President, University of Idaho

ELIZABETH JOHNSON, Chairman, Academic Affairs Committee, State Board of Higher Education, State of Oregon

MARJORIE LYNCH, Regional Director, ACTION, Region 10, Seattle, Washington

JAMES MARQUARDT, M.D., Director, Student Health Center, University of Colorado

Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education

DR. ROBERT H. KROEPSCH, Executive Director

ROBERT L. STUBBLEFIELD, M.D., Associate Director, WICHE, and Director of Mental Health and Related Areas

DR. JAMES H. BANNING, Program Director, Improving Mental Health Services on Western Campuses

LU ANNE AULEPP, Staff Associate, Improving Mental Health Services on Western Campuses